



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## A HISTORY OF ENGLISH RELATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

We desire to return to the original meaning and force of "the which." It has been shown that it often had the force of a demonstrative pointing to a following asyndetic determinative clause. Attention has also been directed to the fact that in this construction there was originally no strong demonstrative before the antecedent with a correlative in the subordinate clause. It is now desired to give a few more examples of this older type of determinative clause to throw light upon the further development.

There is often in Middle English a personal pronoun as antecedent followed by "the which" pointing to a following determinative clause, where in modern English the antecedent is a stressed demonstrative with a correlative relative in the following clause: "ȝyt preyde he God of more grace, / þat he myȝt knowe *hem* by face, / þe *whyche* receyued hyt wurpyly" (Robert of Brunne's "Handlyng Synne," 10191-3) "He prayed God for grace that he might know *thóse* by sight who received it worthily," literally "that he might know them by sight, those, [they] received it worthily." We also find the form "which that" here: "He *which that* hath the shortest shall beginne" (Chaucer's "Prolog," 836). The "which that" like "the which" points to the following clause. The asyndetic construction with "that" is also used here: "And to *hem* speke I alþermoost / þat ledeþ her lyues in pride & boost" ("Cursur," 251-2, Trinity MS.) "And to those I speak the most who spend their lives in pride and boasting." The "þat" points to the following clause just as "the which" and "which that," differing from them only in that it is lighter in weight and indicates a little less pains to be exact and definite. The Cotton MS. has the stressed demonstrative "þoo" *those* here instead of the personal pronoun "hem." This is the new hypotactic type. The common Old English determinatives here were "se seðe." In Middle English this became "he that." The choice of the personal pronoun "he" here for the antecedent shows very clearly that the original

construction was asyndetic. Both "he" and "that" were without stress. Hypotaxis with the strongly stressed demonstrative before the antecedent began in Middle English in the plural as here in the Cotton MS. with the form "þoo that" *those that*. The corresponding singular form "that that" was impossible as there was already a "that that" in use with the force of "what." The modern English form "that one who" became available here, but for some reason its use has never become common as are the similar German forms "derjenige welcher" or "der welcher." Hence the old asyndetic form "he that" lingered on for a long while almost to our day. The feeling for this old form and the modern variation "he who" has not entirely disappeared. These forms are still often seen and heard in biblical language, old saws and modern sayings couched in the phraseology of the older saws, also very often in grammar and dictionaries as a convenient terse rendering of foreign correlatives. In looking over this treatise the writer observed that he has used them himself. He is quite sure, however, that he does not employ them in ordinary conversation. The simplicity of older speech has here been replaced by a great variety of expressions which truly reflect the modern desire for accuracy of expression. We now usually say, with general force "any one that," or more commonly "any one who," "every one who," "that person who," "that man or woman who," "that man that" or more commonly "that man who," "that boy who," etc., plural "those who," or to be precise, "those men who," "those boys who," etc. Thus this hypotactic form has entirely supplanted the older "he the which" and "he which that" and also the simpler "he that," "they that." The forms with "which" have largely disappeared as "which" no longer refers to persons. We can of course still use "which" with reference to things: "These books and *those which* I sold yesterday." The "the" in "the which" and the "that" in "which that" gradually disappeared after the thoro establishment of the strongly stressed demonstratives "that" and "those" as antecedents. The office of pointing was assumed by the stressed demonstrative and "which" became a mere formal relative correlative to the preceding demonstrative. Thus "they the which" and

“they which that” became with reference to things “those which.”

Altho the older asyndetic forms have been supplanted by hypotactic types, asyndesis is too firmly rooted in English feeling to be easily suppressed. Modern asyndetic forms are very common here still wherever there is no occasion to be especially definite. We say: “this man and *the one* we met on the bridge; these men and *the ones* we met on the bridge”; “the man we meet every morning,” not any more in colloquial speech “*he that* or *he whom* we meet every morning.” When the pronoun in the subordinate clause is in the nominative relation we use the fuller asyndetic type with “that”: “*a man that* would do such a thing”: “*the man that* met us on the bridge.” With reference to persons the present usage is inclined to employ “who” here: “*A man who* would do such a thing,” etc. The “who” here may be felt as a real relative pronoun, but historically it has grown up out of the old asyndetic construction with “that.” The “who” simply replaces “that” as a clearer expression for the idea of personality. The “that” itself, however, is often considered a relative, so that the original force of “that” as a demonstrative pointing to a following asyndetic clause is fading away from our consciousness.

A strong clear light is thrown upon the meaning of “which,” “the which,” and “which that” by the fact that they cannot be used when the antecedent is a vague, indefinite pronoun. This force of clear precise reference is still today so strong that we cannot say: “I gave him all *which* I had,” but must use “that,” which is not so definite: “I gave him all *that* I had,” or “all I had.” Thus we say: “Nothing *that* I had pleased him” rather than “Nothing *which* I had pleased him.” Compare also: “I gave him everything *that* I had” (indefinite) and “I gave him every thing *which* I had” (definite). Of course, “which” can be employed after indefinites when the reference becomes definite: “these books and all those *which* are lying on my table.” The writer feels that there is a difference of meaning here if the word “those” is omitted. If the “those” is expressed the reference is definite and the use of “which” is natural. If it is omitted the

reference becomes less definite and there arises a natural impulse to employ "that." Thus also in broad sweeping statements, especially after a superlative, "that," not "which," is used: "That is the best book *that* I have ever read." After a superlative "~~that~~" is also used with reference to persons: "She is the prettiest woman *that* (not *whom*) I have ever seen." Of course, also in the predicate relation where the reference is to the abstract idea of quality rather than to a definite individual "that," not "who," is used: "Fool *that* I am to expect such a thing!" "He is not the man *that* he used to be." Do not confound the indefinite relative "that" with the definite demonstrative "that": "this fruit and *that* (definite demonstrative) I bought yesterday." "Nothing *that* (indefinite relative) I bought pleased him." We may, however, regard "that" as an indefinite relative only in a *comparative* sense. It is indefinite only as compared with "which." At the beginning of the Middle English period it was very much more used than "which." The form "who" had not yet come into use as a relative, so that "that" was the *usual* relative. It was replaced by "which" only when it was desired to make the reference more definite. Thus the indefinite force attached to it in comparison with "which." It is still very common and is used very often where the reference is entirely definite: "the book *that* I hold in my hand." It has been largely replaced by "who" with reference to persons and by "which" for accurate definite reference in case of things. In long intricate sentences "which" is now also often preferred to "that" because it has "greater carrying power" as expressed by Mr. C. Alphonso Smith in his "Short Circuit in English Syntax" in "Modern Language Notes," XIX. It marks more clearly than "that" the adjective relative clause as such and thus enables us to get a clear view thru a long series of clauses, while "that" does not distinguish an adjective relative clause from a substantive or adverbial clause and thus sometimes obscures the view. Let us now return to the older use of "which," especially "the which."

There is in early Middle English often no definite article *before* the antecedent as the following demonstrative "þe quilk" assumes the function of pointing to the following asyn-

detic relative clause: "þas er four vertus principals, / þe quilk man clepes cardinals" ("Cursur," 10007-8) "These are the four principal virtues men call the cardinal virtues." Notice that in modern English we place the demonstrative, i. e. the definite article *before* the noun. To bring out the *full* force of "the quilk" in the original it would be necessary to place "those" before the noun: "These are those four virtues men call," etc. The author of the "Cursur" desired to determine the four virtues more definitely and accurately. Otherwise the form "þat" or the simple asyndetic type without "þat" might have been used here instead of "þe quilk." Similarly there was often no definite article nor modifiers of any kind *before* the antecedent as the following demonstrative "þe quilk" pointed to the following determinative clause: "Pepins þen he gaue him thrin, / þe quilk a þe appel tre he nam þat his fader ete of, adam" ("Cursur," 1366-8) "He gave him those three kernels that he had taken from the apple-tree that his father Adam had eaten of." Here there is no modifying word before "pepins." The author might have placed the definite article before the antecedent and then have used "that" instead of "þe quilk" and this he often does. Again in this example the desire to become accurate and concise is apparent. The word "those" used in the translation was selected to bring out the force of the original. It seems to us too exact. The definite article would accord better with present usage. In Middle English, however, "the which" often stood before the determinative clause where we would today not desire to be so exact. The author of the "Cursur" used "the which" in fairly moderate bounds, but there is already a slight tendency to employ it where the more modest "that" or the simple asyndetic construction without "that" would be more appropriate. Later in the period this tendency increased everywhere. This desire to be definite appeared most commonly in official language, where the labored attempt to be exact manifests itself in all languages. The authors of works of polite literature, learned scholars, and the writers of the official records vied with one another in accuracy of expression. At the close of the fourteenth century the whole situation had changed. The great simplicity

of early Middle English was replaced by a clumsy labored attempt to be accurate. Simple "That" was replaced by "the which" "the which that," or "which that." The excessive fondness for these long forms and their frequent use where the original proper shades were not observed led to the loss of their distinctive meanings and helped to bring them into disrepute.

On the other hand, there are cases where the old demonstrative construction in both modern and Middle English tends to clearness and is much employed, especially where a relative clause has already preceded and it is desired to add another one to make the reference more definite: "pat þai þe yongeist bring in place / pat þai lefte at þeir fader in, / þe quilk þai clepid beniamin" ("Cursur," 4982-4) "that they should bring their youngest brother that they had left at their father's house, the one they called Benjamin." We no longer use "the which" here, but modern "the one" is a faithful rendering of the spirit of Middle English "the which," indeed it is the modern continuation of the older asyndetic usage. This is nicely illustrated also by the following sentence: "His brade blissing he him gaue / þe quilk his broþer wend at haue" (ib. 3713-14) "He (Isaac) gave him (Jacob) his ample blessing, the one his brother (Esau) expected to receive." Here the construction with "the one" does not seem as justifiable as in the preceding sentence. As we look at it closer it makes upon us the impression of an afterthought as if the proper form should have been if we had had time to frame the sentence carefully: "He gave him *the* ample blessing that his brother had expected to receive." In Middle English the clause is not an afterthought. It is the regular form for the definite precise determinative clause. The demonstrative *followed* the antecedent *regularly*. The writer invites the reader to look at the first modern rendering of this sentence once more and examine if there is not something of this very precise form left in the form "the one." Is the clause after all an afterthought? Is it not rather the old precise form that has been preserved in colloquial language? There is one particular case where this old precise form still lingers on. In Middle English a determinative clause intro-

duced by "the which" often limited a noun preceded by the *indefinite* article: "a godd had laban in his bure / þe quilk þat he was wonnt anure" (ib. 3921) "Laban had in his dwelling *the* god *that* he was wont to worship." It is quite evident that the reference is to a definite god and modern English requires the definite article before the antecedent. In older English it was the custom in narrative to introduce by the indefinite article an object mentioned for the first time. After the object was introduced it was further on referred to by the definite article or a demonstrative. This common Middle English sentence reflects this old usage. Even modern English can approach this old construction closely: "Laban had in his dwelling a god, *the one* he was wont to worship." Again the writer is convinced that the clause is not an afterthought, but a real old construction that has been preserved to us in colloquial speech.

As we have seen above "the which" was used as a demonstrative pointing to a following determinative clause corresponding to Old English "seðe" and "se." We should not forget, however, that "seðe" and "se" were also employed in Old English as regular relative pronouns. Now as "the which" assumed the function of older "seðe" and "se" it also assumed their relative function: "For if we luf god in al oure hert, þar es na thyng in vs *thurgh þe whilk* we serve to syn" (Richard Rolle of Hampole's "The Form of Perfect Living," Horstmann's ed. p. 37). The presence of the preposition before "þe whilk" shows clearly that the construction is relative, not asyndetic. In the "Cursur" the real relative use of "þe quilk" after prepositions is quite rare, as the old simple asyndetic construction still prevails. The relative construction of "quilk þat" is also little used here: "and þe haligast i-wiss, / *wit quilk þat* he smerd is" (19987-8) "and surely the Holy Ghost with which he is annointed." Even in Chaucer, who has such a pronounced fondness for "the whiche" and "which that" in the asyndetic type, we find these forms very little used after prepositions in the relative construction. The relative points *backward* to the antecedent and at the same time marks the beginning of the determinative clause. Thus the "the" in "the which" and the "that" in



“which that” are perfectly useless and out of place in the *relative* construction, while in the *asyndetic* type they perform a useful function in pointing forward to the following asyndetic determinative clause. From the very beginning of the Middle English period simple “which” was more common after prepositions than the longer forms, as it more readily adapted itself to the real relative construction by reason of its lack of clear demonstrative form. On account of its frequent use here and the growing tendency in later literature to employ the hypotactic form, the boundaries of simple “which” were widened as over against “the which” and “which that.”

Clear hypotactic form also appeared wherever a stressed demonstrative was placed before the antecedent: “*þat* name the whylke gyffes comforthe to me in all angwys (Richard Rolle de Hampole,” p. 1). “And in our yerd *tho* herbes shall I finde, / the whiche han of hir propretee by kinde, / to purgen yow binethe and eek above” (Chaucer’s “The Nonne Preetes Tale,” 131-2). Attention has already been called above to the appearance of this new type in cases where the antecedent was a pronoun. Both where the antecedent was a stressed demonstrative and where it was a noun preceded by a stressed demonstrative the stressed form with its strong demonstrative force robbed “the which” of its old function of pointing to the determinative clause and reduced it to the rank of a mere correlative relative pronoun. The “the” in “the which” and the “that” in “which that” in time disappeared as the demonstrative force was incompatible with their new rank of correlative relative pronoun. Thus the new form became “that name which,” “those herbs which,” etc.

The writer cannot find anywhere any attempt to explain the rise of this very important new type. To him the placing of the demonstrative before the antecedent belongs to the general movement affecting the position of adjective elements. In oldest English adjective elements might stand after the noun where today the position before the noun is imperative. The complicated history of the word order of the adjective elements cannot be given here. The adjective elements that once followed the noun occupied this position in a functional

capacity. For instance, the demonstrative followed the noun that it might point to the following asyndetic relative clause. The demonstrative that once had the function of standing at the end of the *principia* proposition to point to the following clause took this function with it when it followed the general movement of the adjective elements to the position before the noun. It was not at first more strongly stressed than it was in its old position. A study of a large number of the oldest examples reveals that there is no tangible difference of meaning or emphasis between the old and the new construction. As it now in its new position stood before a noun it was often for the sake of emphasis strongly stressed just as the regular attributive "that." With this emphasis came a distinct differentiation of this type from the older form. Of course, *the stress was not always present nor is it today*, but it became the characteristic feature of the construction, for the "that" was always capable of stress whenever there was need of emphasis. The new attributive demonstrative did not like the usual attributive demonstrative point to a visible individual or object but to the description of an individual contained in a following clause, the beginning of which was marked by the correlative relative. Where did the correlative relative come from? The original form of "*þat tre þat was sua suete*" ("Cursur," 8292) "that tree that was so sweet" was "*þe tre þat was sua suete*." In case of a plural antecedent the "*þat*" became "*þaa*," or "*þo*," later "those," as the demonstrative that stood *before* a noun had a plural form: "*to þaa men þat boodword bar*" (ib. 14174) "to those men that bore the message." When "*þat*" moved into the position before the antecedent it displaced "*þe*." This change left a gap after the antecedent, for "*þat*" had taken the place of "*þe*" before the antecedent. In the examples from the *Cursur*, however, there is a "*þat*" where this gap ought to be. This is a later development. We now select a sentence that shows the gap: "*þat ilk cupe þai soght þai fand*" (ib., 4916) "that very cup they sought they found." Modern English as can be seen by the translation preserves this form. It is still common: "I have just bought *that* book we looked at yesterday." This development gave the language a new asyndetic form. In-

stead of an *unaccented* article before the antecedent there is in the new type a demonstrative which is more or less *accented*. Here as elsewhere the asyndetic construction without "þat" can be replaced by the fuller form with "that," "which," "the which," "the which that," or "which that." All of these forms occur. The demonstrative after the antecedent, however, has lost its importance on account of the presence of the stressed demonstrative before the antecedent. The new type was soon felt as a hypotactic construction and the "the" in "the which" and the "that" in "which that" finally dropped out. This new hypotactic type with the stressed demonstrative before the antecedent influenced the old asyndetic type "he that," "they that." The unstressed personal pronoun became a stressed demonstrative as in "those that."

John Purvey was very fond of the new hypotactic type with the stressed demonstrative before the antecedent or in case of a pronominal antecedent a demonstrative instead of a personal pronoun: "*tho* thingis that ben of God, ben ordeyned" (Romans, 13.1). "And he bihelde *thilke* (= *tho*) that satan about hym" (Mark 3.35). Wyclif has here: "and beholdynge *hem* aboute that saten in the cumpas of hym." The northerner Wyclif uses the old asyndetic type, while the Midlander employs the new hypotactic form. Purvey himself very often uses the old type, but his pronounced fondness for the new form explains his dropping the "the which's" of Wyclif in his revision. Hypotactic form was deeply rooted in his feeling. The new hypotactic type with its greater terseness and elegance of form adapted itself better than the clumsy older type to the general tendency toward terseness of expression. Purvey seemed to follow instinctively the newer tendencies of the language.

The rise of this new type with an accented demonstrative before the antecedent did not destroy the old asyndetic form. It survived, however, only in the simplest forms. Early in Middle English it was possible to say: "the book *that*, *which*, *the which that*, or *which that* I hold in my hand. Of these different forms only two survive: "the book *that* or *which* I hold in my hand." Historically considered they are both

asyndetic in structure. Both "that" and "which" were originally demonstratives pointing to the following asyndetic determinative clause. Why did the "the" and the "that" drop out of the long forms? There seems to be only one answer. The determinative clause was felt as a relative construction and there was no longer need of a demonstrative form to point to the following asyndetic clause. The great abuse of the long forms had brought them into disrepute and the growth of hypotaxis was decidedly unfavorable to them. The relative of the hypotactic construction was a mere formal connective without inner meaning. Thus the long forms with their unwieldy size and their meaning significant but suggestive of things that no longer harmonized with their new rank of mere formal connective became gradually more and more foreign to the feeling of a time that had learned to prefer in speech elegance of form to awkward forcefulness.

In the preceding pages the use of Old English "seðe" and "se" and Middle English "the which" and "the which that," "which that" and simple "which" has been discussed. The relation between the principal proposition and the following determinative clause was in all these constructions quite close. In Old English "se" was also used in the South and Midland to join loosely to some word in the principal proposition an explanatory statement or a clause containing some additional information: "Ðæt is swiðe sweotol to ongitanne be sumum romaniscum æþelinge, *se* wæs haten Liberius" (King Alfred's "Boethius," Sedgefield's ed. p. 36) "That is to be seen very clearly in the case of a certain Roman nobleman whose name was Liberius." Originally parataxis was employed for such a loose relation and this older construction is still very common in oldest English: "þa wæs sum consul þæt we herotoha hatað, Boetius wæs gehaten" (ib. p. 8) "There was a certain consul or duke as we say whose name was Boethius." Parataxis is the natural English construction here. The relative construction arose under Latin influence. In early Middle English "se" became "ðe," but it soon disappeared entirely as it was not felt as a clear relative form. The relative "which" which was employed in determinative restrictive clauses was also introduced into these clauses

where the connection was loose. This usage prevailed thruout the South and the Midland. In the North the corresponding form was "þe quilk." This corresponds to the northern use of "seðe" in Old English. This longer form occurs with remarkable regularity in the Lindisfarne Glosses, while in the southern writers simple "se" is more common; "Mið ðy efern uutedlice geworden were cuom summ monn wlong from arimathia ðæs wæs noma ioseph seðe ðe discipul was ðæs hælendes" (Matth. 27.57) "When the evening had come there came a certain rich man of Arimathea who was called Joseph who also himself was Jesus' disciple." In this sentence there are two relatives each introducing a loose relative clause. The first relative is "se," the second is "seðe." In the Corpus Ms. "se" occurs in both clauses. Thus the glossarist of the Lindisfarne MS. knows both forms in this use, but he very often employs "seðe" where we in the South find simple "se." The North seemed to prefer the longer form here and elsewhere. Hence when "seðe" had disappeared the form "þe quilk," which was elsewhere used with the same force as "seðe," took its place, not only where the connection was close but also here for loose connection: "þat ilk dai a propheci said symeon of vr leuedi, / of hir and of her sun iesu, / þe quilk i sal sai yow nu" ("Cursur," 11357-6 0). This "þe quilk" spread southward in the form of "the which" and enjoyed for a long while great favor, but later it disappeared here as also elsewhere. Now we employ here "which" for things and "who" for persons. Altho Old English "se" was generally replaced in early Middle English by "which" and "the which" the neuter form "þæt," later "that," lingered on for a long while in the Middle English period wherever it referred to a sentence: "Lo, nece, I trowe ye han herd al how / the king... / hath mad eschaunge of Antenor and yow, / that cause is of this sorrow and this unreste" (Chaucer's "Troilus and Criseyde," 876-9). Later "which" replaced also here the older form.

Both "which" and "the which" were not only used as pronouns as in all preceding cases, but they were also used as adjectives standing before a noun: "For-þi lete god þam lijf sua lang / þat thai moght seke and vnderfang / þe kynd o

things þat þan were dern, / curs o sun and mone and stern, / þe *quilk* curs moght nan fulli lere / þat moght noght liue an hundret yere" ("Cursur," 1541-6) "Therefore God let them live so long that they could understand the nature of things that then were hidden, the course of sun and moon and the stars, which course no one could fully learn who could not live a hundred years." The loss of inflection made the reference much less definite than in the older inflected language and the antecedent was often repeated preceded by "which" or "the which" to make the reference perfectly clear. The weakness of the new uninflected form became apparent at once, and so we find this adjective use in the oldest northern documents. The adjective form sprang up out of the pronominal form, which as we have seen above was originally a demonstrative. As the pronominal relative form sometimes retained the older demonstrative form so also the adjective form: "The king gredy of commune slaughter caste him to transporten up al the ordre of the senat the gilt of his real majestee, of *the whiche* gilt *that* Albin was accused" (Chaucer's "Boethius," I, Prose 4) "The king planned to prefer against the entire body of the senate the charge of high treason of which Albin had been accused. The rough translation does not at all bring out the intricate tangle of the language. The words "the which that" are the old demonstrative asyndetic type and originally pointed to something following, so that they originally meant: "that charge, that one, Albin was accused of [it]. In Chaucer's sentence the preposition *before* the relative indicates clearly that the construction is relative. The old demonstrative and the new relative type had been mingled.

This new construction was often more convenient than elegant: "And anon a man in unclene spirit ran out of a biryel to hym goynge out of the boot, *the whiche* man hadde an hous in graues or biriels" (Wyclif's Mark 5.2-3 about A. D. 1380). John Purvey who has simplified so many of Wyclif's sentences wasn't able to solve this difficulty. Gradually it became evident that the antecedent must be brought as near to the end of the principal proposition and as near to the relative as possible so that the reference might become definite: "And

when he was come out of the shyp there met hym out of the graues a man possessed of an vncleane sprite / which had his abydyng amonge the graues" (Mark 5. 2-3, William Tindale, A. D. 1534). The authors of the King James version usually follow Tindale quite closely, but they here improved upon his language in that they chose the new relative form "who" instead of the older "which" so as to bring out the idea of personality more clearly: "And when hee was come out of the ship immediately there met him out of the tombes a man with an vncleane spirit who had his dwelling among the tombs" (A. D. 1611). It is quite probable that it was from such cases that the use of "who" began to encroach upon the province of "which" and "that," so that its almost uniform use today without regard to the closeness of the connection wherever there is a reference to persons threatens to break down the old distinction that "who" indicates a looser connection than "that": "those that are heavy" (of things); "those who are heavy"; "the man whom we met on the bridge." Of course wherever there is a reference to *things* in such involved sentences as those cited above the simple expedient of using "who" cannot be employed and recourse must sometimes be had to the inelegant "which" and the repeated antecedent.

The adjective form is not only used as in the preceding examples where the connection between the relative clause and the main proposition is loose, but also where the connection is close as in the determinative construction: "But what shall I saye of delices of body of whiche delices the desiringes ben ful of anquish and the fulfillingss of hem ben ful of penaunce?" (Chaucer's "Boethius," III, Prose 7). Here there is an evident desire to connect the relative closely with the word "delices," and hence the repetition becomes necessary. Perspicuity is the highest law in language, and even elegance must yield to its demands.

The rise of this construction is contemporaneous with French influence, but it would be very difficult to prove that its origin is due to this source. It arose naturally from the loss of inflection and the new and difficult problems that resulted from that new condition. It came as naturally and

as inevitably as the change in the word-order. The development was natural because in early Middle English when this construction arose "which" was often a demonstrative adjective and stood *before* the noun which is limited: "*Wulc wræcche folc swa mihte fleh ut of þeode*" (Layamon's "Brut," 29143-4) "Those wretched people who could fled out of the country." At this same time "which" was also used as a relative. That it should be used as a demonstrative and at the same time as a relative is what we have seen repeatedly above in case of the *relatives* "which," "the which," "which that," which had not yet laid aside their former distinctive *demonstrative* forms. The fact that similar conditions had existed in French is convincing proof to some scholars that our English forefathers simply borrowed this construction from the French. We have the example of the development of the relative "which" in English and the relative "welch" in German. There is not the slightest relation between these parallel developments. The writer speaks a language full of French words and he knows that French has greatly influenced the English vocabulary, but he has learned to acknowledge the influence of French upon the *grammatical* structure of English only when the proof is indisputable.

Just as Old English "swa hwylc swa" developed from the indefinite general relative into the definite relative "which" Old English "swa hwa swa" *whoever* developed into the definite relative "who." The development has been sketched above in connection with the history of the relative "which." Altho the oblique cases of "who" were early in Middle English used as genuine relatives as described above the nominative form "hwa" in the original indefinite expression "swa hwa swa" was used as a demonstrative. The literal meaning of this expression is "that that one that." The first "swa" dropped out later and the second "swa" was usually replaced by "that." Thus tho "whose" and "whom" were widely used as relatives the nominative "who that" had the force of a demonstrative pointing to a following asyndetic relative clause: "for *who þat entreþ þer*, / he his (=is) sauþf euere-more" (William of Shoreham's "De Baptismo," 5-6). "For *that one that enters there is safe for evermore.*" The same



usage also occurs in the oblique cases in spite of the fact that "who" is here usually employed as a relative: "Me thinketh this that thou were depe y-holde / to *whom that* saved thee fro cares colde!" (Chaucer's "Legend of Good Women," VI, 70) "deeply indebted to *that one that* saved you," etc. Later also the nominative "who" as described above was used as a relative. The general indefinite form "who that" was replaced by "whoever."

In the same manner the general indefinite neuter form "swa hwæt swa" *whatever* developed into the definite relative "what": "Sell me, Peterr, for erpliȝ fe / off hali Gast swile mahte, / þurh *what* icc muȝhe speken wel / wiþþ alle þede spæchess" ("Ormulum 16060-2) "Sell me, Peter, for earthly goods that power of the Holy Ghost by which I can speak the languages of all peoples." This relative use of "what" is still found in Shakespeare: "I fear nothing *what* can be said against me (Hen. VIII V.1). This usage was never widespread for there was no real need of "what" as a relative as "which" or "that" could always take its place.

The use of "what" as a relative developed from older demonstrative force just as in case of "who" and "which." This demonstrative meaning developed very early and is still often observed. It was already clearly developed in Old English: "þonne mihte we micle þe eð geþolian *swa hwæt* earfoðnessa *swa* us on become" (King Alfred's "Boethius, Sedgefield's ed., p. 23). "Then could we all the easier endure *what* hardships would befall us," literally *that that* of hardships *that*, [it] would befall us." This Old English example explains fully how a neuter form could stand before a noun with a different gender. The "hwæt" is a neuter pronoun modified by the following genitive "earfoðnessa." In early Middle English the grammatical relations here could no longer be seen as the loss of inflection obscured the vision and "what" was interpreted as a demonstrative adjective modifying the following noun: "*What* mann *se* shall forrwerppenn þiss / to lefenn and to trowenn, / þat mann iss nuzzu demnd" ("Ormulum," 17747-9) "That man who will refuse to believe this, that man is condemned." Old English "swa" appears here as "se." The literal force is "that man, that

one." The demonstrative "that" is also often used instead of "se": "*What man that* is norissed by fortune she maketh him a great fool" (Chaucer's *Melibeus*, 2643-5). "*What that* I may helpe, it shal not fayle" (id., *Troilus and Criseyde*, IV, 938). The modern form here is "whatever": *Whatever* claim I had I resign." "*Whatever* I suffer I have brought upon myself." In Middle English simple "what" was often employed instead of "what—that" in a sense a little less general and indefinite: "For it is set in your hand . . . *what* fortune yow is levest" (Chaucer's "Boethius," IV. Prose 7). Simple "what" is now widely used: "The entertainer provides *what* fare he pleases." "I gave him a list of *what* books I needed." Here "what" is a demonstrative still, followed by an asyndetic relative clause. We might with only slightly changed meaning substitute "those" or with weak force "the" for "what": "I gave him a list of *those* or *the* books I needed." Modern usage makes a slight difference between "what" and "those" or "the." We can only use "what" when the reference is somewhat vague. Thus we cannot say: "I gave him the name of *what* book I needed." The plural without the article is always indefinite and hence we can say: "I gave him the names of *what* books I needed." Of course we can use "what" before a singular noun if the reference is indefinite: "I told you *what* book I needed," but with definite reference: "This is *the* book I needed." In the latter case the reference is perfectly definite, in the former case something is introduced without exact and definite description. The idea of indefiniteness that now dwells in the demonstrative "what" makes the following lines of Milton seem a little quaint: "He it was whose guile / stirred up with envy and revenge deceived / the mother of mankind, *what* time his pride / had cast him out from heaven." We would now say "the" instead of "what" as the reference is definite. The older language did not distinguish so nicely here. Even prominent grammarians have misinterpreted modern usage here and represent "what" as declining in usage. On the contrary, it is even necessary in modern usage where a general or indefinite idea is to be expressed. We must say: "We say *what* we know," not "We speak *that* we do know" (St. John,

3.2.), nor "*that that we know*" as formerly. We use "what" exclusively in substantive clauses. The reference often seems definite, but it will usually appear upon closer thought to be indefinite as something is introduced without exact and definite description: "Here is *what* I was looking for." Shakespeare's "If this be not *that* you look for" (*Taming of the S.*, 4, 4, 97) seems to us today too definite. This indefinite use of "what" occurs also in a question: "*What* are you looking for?" The use of "what" is not declining, but it has received more definite boundaries. It is often used today where it was not employed in earlier periods and is often obsolete where it was once common.

The development of "the which" out of "seðe suæ hwælc" has been given above. It would be natural to expect the development of the corresponding form "the who," as we find in the Lindisfarne Glosses the corresponding Old English form "seðe sua hwa": "*Seðe sua hwa mec onfoað onfoað done ilca seðe mec sende*" (Luke 9.48) "He who receives me receives him who sent me." The corresponding Middle English form "the who" occurs only rarely: "The ferste of hem so as I rede, / was Morpheus, *the whos* nature / is forto take the figure / of what person that him liketh" (Gower's "Confessio Amantis," IV 3038-41). "And as it were a wilde beste, / *the whom* no reson mihte areste" (ib. II, 161-2). Three more examples from Gower are given in Morris' "Historical Outlines of English Accidence," p. 131. These few examples are the only ones that the writer has been able to find altho he has spent a good deal of time in a fruitless search for more. There is such a long period of time and a large stretch of space between the Lindesfarne Glosses of Durham and the language of this southerner that it seems absolutely impossible to see a relationship between the language of the two documents. It is much more probable that "the who" is a mere analogical formation after the pattern of "the which." The form "seðe sua hwa" of the Durham glossarist was not as deeply rooted in the speech-feeling of his northern countrymen as "seðe suæ huælc" and disappeared entirely. Later the southern poet Gower had a similar inspiration, but it likewise found no warm sympathetic reception.

The development of the general indefinite relative has been treated above in connection with the definite relative. It is only desired to say a word here about the late form "whoever." In oldest and Middle English there is here some sort of a demonstrative after the relative: "swa hwa swa," "wha se," "qua sa," "who that," "quatsum," etc., often, however, the simple form "who," "qua," "what." At the close of the Old English period a new form arose in which the adverb "ever" took the place of the demonstrative: "el þat æfre betst wæs" (Chronicle for the year 1048) "Whatever was best." "All þatt æfre iss sinne and woh / all comm þatt off þe defell" ("Ormulum," 18767-8) "Whatever is sin and wrong came from the devil." "To gedir wrightes far and nere, / *quareuer* þat þai funden were" ("Cursur," 4671-2, Cotton MS.), "quare þai *euer* fundyn were" (Fairfax MS.), "quare þat *euer* þai funden were" (Göttingen M.S.) "to gather workmen far and near wherever they might be found." "Quatsum *euer* þou se or here" (ib. 10508) "whatever thou seest or hearest." "And who *euere* schulen not resseyue, ne here þou" (Wyclif, Mark 6.11) Here as so often elsewhere Chaucer by the almost uniform use of "whoso," "who that" "Whatso," "What that," "Wher that" shows that he is in touch with older English, while John Purvey by the use of "who euer" (Wyclif's "who euere"), "What eure," "where euer" makes manifest that he feels the newer life of the language. It is so evident that this new usage which began at a period when English was free from French influence is a natural English development that the writer does not think it necessary to reply to Mr. Einkenel's claim of influence from Old French "qui que onkes."

The form "who" is so deeply rooted in present speech-feeling as a relative or an interrogative that its original use as an indefinite pronoun with the meaning "some one" is entirely forgotten. This oldest meaning, however, has come down to the present period in one peculiar idiomatic saying "as who should (or would) say": "The Father of the Marshalsea glanced at a passing Collegian *as who should* say, 'An enfeebled old man this'" (Dickens L. D. 19), literally, "as if one would say," or "as if *he* would say," for "who

in this particular idiom is indefinite in *form* but definite in *meaning*. Similarly Bosshart in "Die Barrettlitochter, p. 136 has said: "Wer's könnte, wie er!" "If *I* could only do as he did!" There is here the force of a condition in the clause introduced by "wer." This conditional idea often occurs in this construction: "Fragen ist keine Schande, *wer* ein Ding nicht weiss" (Grimm) "It is not a disgrace to ask a question if one doesn't know." "þe hali writte lies na wight, / qua can vnderstand þe right" ("Cursur," 14702-3) "Holy Writ doesn't lie if one can understand the right." There is often in Middle English a subjunctive in such conditional clauses where they follow the conjunction "as": "Syppen looked God vppon Iudas, as who sey, 'aske mercy for þy trespass'" (Robert of Brunne's "Handlyng Synne," 5193-4) "Afterwards Jesus looked upon Judas as if we would say: 'Ask mercy for thy trespass.'" The subjunctive here seems to point to quite ancient usage, for the subjunctive was once common in such clauses altho the writer has not been able to find cases in older English in this one particular saying. It seems to be a colloquial expression that had not found its way into the older literary language. The subjunctive is the particular use found in indefinite general clauses: "He that troubleth you shall bear his judgment, whosoever he *be*" (Galatians 5.10, King James version). We now usually employ "maybe" here. In Middle English the subjunctive tho not common was more frequent than today: "And qua oþer ouercom in field / þe toper folk al til him yeild" ("Cursur" 7463) "Whoever may overcome the other in the field let the other party yield to him," or "If one of you should overcome the other in the field let," etc. The subjunctive here has exactly the same force as in the sentence from Robert of Brunne and the construction is also the same in the two clauses. Both are indefinite general clauses introduced by "who" *whoever*. Hence the literal meaning of the passage from Robert of Brunne is: "Jesus looked upon Judas as *some one who* or *whoever* may say," etc., or "Jesus looked upon Judas as if he would say," etc. Here as so often elsewhere the indefinite general force developed into definite reference. The position of the clause after "as," which in Middle English often

meant "as if," gradually led to the idea of a conditional clause. This development was very easy and natural as the original general relative construction with the present subjunctive was little used and not vividly felt, while the conditional idea was elsewhere often associated with clauses introduced by "who" *whoever* as illustrated above. As the conjunction, "as" *as if* usually was associated with the past subjunctive, the form for the expression of unreality, the present subjunctive in this construction was replaced by the past, usually the past subjunctive of an auxiliary verb: "Ho turned her ouer wiþ hit in arme / *as qua sulde sai*: 'I know na harme' " ("Cursur," 8611-12, Fairfax MS.) "She turned over with it (the child) in her arms as if she would say: 'I know of no harm.' " The older construction with the present subjunctive is more common in the "Cursur." The newer form alone has come down to the present period.

Parallel with the construction with the present subjunctive described above is the use of the indicative to represent the statement not as a mere conception but as an actuality: "But of the thinges that ben taken also it is necessarie, *as who sayth*, it folweth of that which that is purposed biforn" (Chaucer's "Boethius," IV Prose 4) "It is a necessary result of the things that have preceded, *as we say* (literally *as one says*), it follows from that which was planned in advance." Here "as who seyth" has the force, of "in other words." In this translation Chaucer uses "as who seyth" a great many times, often over and over again on the same page. In his struggle to translate accurately he seeks as in the above example a second expression for the thought of the original that he has just rendered. In one passage at the opening of Book II, Prose I after essaying a translation of the introductory sentence he starts again introducing the second rendering by the words: "as who mighte seyn thus" *one might express it thus*.

In "Anglia XXVII pp. 136-9 and in Paul's "Grundriss" p. 1119 Mr. Eienkel essays to prove the French origin of "as who says." He argues that the use of the subjunctive form "say(e)" described above must have come from a *foreign* source as the English subjunctive had almost disappeared.

The subjunctive in general indefinite clauses, however, was as we have seen above actually in use not only in this one saying but also elsewhere and is even found much later. Mr. Einkenkel cannot accept the English origin of "as who say(e)" as there are no examples in Old English usage, but he assumes Old French origin altho he has not been able to find any cases of the subjunctive form in actual use. The modern French form is "comme qui *dirait*" with the conditional but he assumes that there must have been an older form "Comme qui *disse*" with the subjunctive as the subjunctive is used in the Middle English, that is, he discovers an unknown Old French syntactical construction from its presence in English. Even if he could find actual cases of it in Old French the French origin of the English usage would not be assured. There is something peculiarly West Germanic in this construction as attested by the close correspondence of German and English here as illustrated above.

Mr. Einkenkel has written a number of interesting things about French influence upon English, but he is so bent upon discovering French influence that he often jumps to conclusions, so that we must in general be on our guard in reading him. We have room here for the consideration of only one more of these discoveries. On page 1119 of Pauls "Grundriss" Mr. Einkenkel remarks: "Sicher sind die häufigen *chose qui* = *thing that* = ne. *what*, z. b. afrz. *s'il avoit dit chose qui fust contre l'honneur* Comm. > me. *alday fayleth thinge that fooles wenden Ch.*" The writer has spent a valuable part of his life in deciphering such German hieroglyphics, but as he is not brilliant by nature he is not real sure that he has caught the meaning. As the passage is with a number of others that show French influence upon English he assumes that this sentence means that Old French "*chose qui*" led to the frequent use of "thing that" in Middle English, which in the modern period has become "what." It is strange that a student of English could have failed to notice the fondness of Englishmen for a noun where other languages would use a relative pronoun: "cypaþ iohanne þa *ding* þe ge gehyrdon" (Matth. 11.4, Corpus) "sægðas ge [iohannes] ða *worda* geherdon" (Lindisfarne Glosses) "renuntiate iohanni *quae*

audistis'' (Lindisfarne Latin text) "Shew John again *those things* which ye do hear" (King James Version). In the writer's own feeling it is still common and natural to say: "Tell John *the things* you have heard." Of course "what" is also sometimes heard here, but it certainly is not true that it has replaced "the things" as indicated in the hieroglyphic formula of Mr. Einkenkel. Similarly we use "the things" where in other languages we may find a demonstrative pronoun: "bige þa þing þe us þearf sy" (John 13.29, Corpus) "ema ea quae opus sunt nobis" "buy *the things* we need."

The relative "as" arose in early Middle English in the combination "such as": "wiþþ all *swille* rime *alls* her iss sett" ("Ormulum," dedication 1.101) "With just such a poetical measure as is presented here." This usage survives. Its spirit is the same as that which characterized the early Middle English construction, i. e. is asyndetic. The "alls" (=all so) in "Ormulum" is a demonstrative pointing to the following asyndetic relative clause. The construction has undergone no development and hence remains asyndetic. It is now limited to the combinations "such—as," "the same—as," "as (or so) much—as," "as (or so) many—as." It was once more widely used following a noun or any demonstrative: "The first Soudan was Zarocon...*as* was fadre to Sahaladyn" (Mandeville's "Voiage," v. 36). "Those *as* sleep and think not on their sins" (Shakespeare's "Merry Wives of W. 5.5).

In looking back over the development of the English relative constructions the distinctive feature of the earlier periods is the asyndetic structure of the sentences. Thus there is often no sign to indicate the conditional idea: "*Qua* has to wenden ani wai, / god es to go bi light of dai" ("Cursur" 14194-5) "If one has to go on a journey it is good to go in the light of day," literally "Whoever has to go on a journey, it is good to go in the light of day." The two propositions simply lie side by side without any formal sign of subordination. The causal idea likewise has no formal expression: "And she that was not lernyd to recyue suche gestes sore hard was his queyntaunce to her" ("Caxton's "Blanchardyn," p. 67) "As she was not experienced in receiving such guests his



company was a sore trial to her," literally "She, that one, [she] was not experienced in receiving such guests, his company was a sore trial to her. Thus there is a series of utterances connected not by the form but by the thought. Notice that this sentence is exactly like the following saying of King Alfred: "Se seðe hine forðencð se bið ormod" ("Boethius," Sedgefield's ed. p. 19) "That, that one there, [he] despairs, that one is sad." Old English "se seðe" should become in Middle English "that that that," but the awkward and ambiguous combination was avoided and the new form "he that" arose. Thus Caxton's sentence resembles King Alfred's in every particular. No real change had taken place in the language. Mr. Leon Kellner in his "Historical Outlines of English Syntax" p. 65 remarks on such sentences: "The adjective clause of the older periods is deficient in point of consistency and unity—it is pleonastic and anacoluthic—the modern one grammatically correct." There is, however, no lack of consistency or unity in the older sentence. It is consistently asyndetic. The unit is each utterance. It is also not ungrammatical as Dr. Kellner implies. Each utterance is as grammatical as the most finished sentence of a modern master. By "ungrammatical" and "anacoluthic" Dr. Kellner undoubtedly means such sentences as: "A knight ther was and that a worthy man, / *that* fro the tyme that he first bigan/ to ryden out, he loved chivalrye" (Chaucer's "Prolog," 43-5,. At first sight it seems that the "that" after "man" is a relative and introduces a relative clause and that later the poet changed the construction and employed the personal pronoun "he" as subject of the verb "loved," forgetting that he had already made "that" the subject. The sentence is, however, in the strictest sense grammatical, but fashioned after a very old pattern. The "that" after "man" is a demonstrative. It points to the following asyndetic relative clause: "fro the tyme that he first bigan to ryden out he loved chivalrye." Here the pronominal subject of the clause, "he," is expressed. It is usually understood but in such a setting is expressed also in Old English. Attention has been called above to a sentence from Hans Sach which is exactly like it: "Mein Herr, ich bin *der* man, die männer ich

gefressen han, die selber waren Herr im Haus." ("Der Narrenfresser" 11.59-61). In both the German and the English sentence the demonstrative points to a complete clause which describes what kind of a man the person in question is.

The great difference between the older and the modern type is clearly seen in the following example: "Ðonne wæs Biise Eastengla biscop, þe we sægdon þætte in þæm foresprecenan seonoðe wære" (Beda's "Ecclesiastical History," p. 280.11-12) "Then Bise was bishop of the East Angles, who, we have already said, was present in the before-mentioned synod," literally: "Then Bise was bishop of the East Angles, that one, we have already said that, [he] was present in the before-mentioned synod." The subject of the last clause is usually omitted, but it is sometimes expressed, which proves conclusively that "þe" cannot be a relative particle: "in þære cirican seo ewen gewunade hire gebiddan, þe we ær cwædon þæt heo Christen wære" (ib., p. 62, 5-6) "The queen usually prayed in the church, who, we have already said, was a Christian," literally: "In the church prayed the queen, that one, we have already said that she was a Christian." The two forms are quite different altho they are both asyndetic. In the first form the proposition after "þe" is a parenthetical insertion and thus separates the parts of the sentence, while in the second form "we ær cwædon þæt heo Christen wære" is as a whole an asyndetic relative clause to which the preceding "þe" points. Within this asyndetic clause "þæt heo Christen wære" is an object clause, object of the verb "cwædon." These two forms remain intact in Middle English: (first form): "I am he that thou knowe that dyd doo destroye Rome" (Caxton's "Charles the Grete," 52.30) "I am he who, you know, caused Rome to be destroyed," literally: "I am he, that one, you know that, [he] caused Rome to be destroyed. (Second form) "Her sorrowe that she contynually made for her right dere frende blonchardyn, that for the loue of her she trowed that he had other be lost or ded" (id., "Blanchardyn," 120.11) "the sorrow which she continually felt for her very dear friend Blanchardyn, who, she believed, for the love of her had either been lost or was dead," literally: "the sorrow which she felt for Blanchardyn, that one,

for the love of her she believed that he had either been lost or was dead." In the second form the "that" introducing the object clause can usually be omitted: "They know *that* he is rich," or "They know he is rich." By glancing at the modern free rendering of these two forms it will become evident that the modern form is a blending of the two older forms. As in the second form it drops the "that" before the last clause, but otherwise it has the construction of the first form. The clause after the relative is a parenthetical insertion. The word after the antecedent, formerly "that," now more commonly "who" for persons and "which" for things, is now felt as a *relative* pronoun which is the subject or object of the verb in the last proposition. The construction has become hypotactic. This development seems perfectly clear to the writer, but two well-known scholars have given quite different explanations, Leon Kellner in his *Historical Outlines*, pp. 69-70 and Alois Pogatscher in "*Anglia*" XXIII, pp. 290-3. Earlier in the period the nominative of the relative clause was sometimes replaced by an accusative as it was felt as the object of the following verb: "Of Arthur *whom* they say is kill'd tonight" (Shakspeare's "*King John*," IV, 2.165). Mr. Kellner follows this usage in his "*Historical Outlines*" p. 70, where he translates the first sentence from Caxton quoted above: "*whom* thou knowest did cause to be destroyed." The writer feels that this usage is now dead. The hypotactic form as used today is a model of simplicity and compactness compared with the older asyndetic type.

From a comparison of the modern and the older form of the examples given in the last two paragraphs it becomes quite evident that the real difference between modern English and the language of the older periods is that older English is asyndetic and modern English hypotactic. The hypotactic type was the prevailing form of the language after the close of the fifteenth century, but as we have seen above it had appeared long before that time and was slowly but surely gaining ground.

G. O. CURME.

*Northwestern University.*